

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/026,199	12/21/2001	Thomas J. Lanoue	25653.0006.0	8442
30166	7590 07/27/2005		EXAM	INER
WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE PLLC			NGUYEN, TUYEN T	
300 N. GREENE STREET SUITE 1900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GREENSBORO, NC 27401			2832	
			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/026,199	LANOUE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	TUYEN T. NGUYEN	2832			
- The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty beriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	11 July 200 <u>5</u> .				
	•				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>19-40</u> is/are pending in the applied 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>19-40</u> is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	hdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the canonical the canonical the canonical term and the canonical term and the canonical term and the canonical term are t	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · ·			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur 2. Certified copies of the priority docur 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Br	ments have been received. ments have been received in Ap priority documents have been r ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) 🗍 Intention C	mman (PTO 413)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	8) Paper No(s).	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagenbucher [US 4,129,938] in view of Martincic et al. [US 3,548,355].

Hagenbucher discloses a transformer comprising:

- a tubular coil formed of a plurality of layers formed from a length of conductive material having a central axis with insulation layer, wherein the coil having an open core;
- a plurality of cooling ducts [2, figure 1] spaced between the plurality of conductive material layers, wherein the cooling duct formed of a fiber-reinforced material and having an elliptical cross-section with a linear dimension being greater a width and defining a cooling passage that is parallel to the central axis of the conductive coil; and
- a resin [abstract] encapsulating the plurality of conductive material layers and the plurality of cooling ducts.

Hagenbucher discloses the instant claimed invention except for the specific material used to form the cooling ducts.

Martincic et al. discloses a resin molded coil for a transformer comprising elliptical cross-

section cooling ducts [72] disposed in encapsulated resin [70], wherein the cooling ducts formed

of polyester mixed with fiberglass. Martincic et al. inherently discloses the fiberglass polyester

in the form of polyester resin.

It would have been an obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to use the duct design of Martincic et al. in Hagenbucher for the purpose of

protecting the ducts during coil manufacture.

Regarding claims 21-23, 30-32, 34, 36-37 and 39, the specific resin material use for the

cooling ducts and the resin encapsulation would have been an obvious design consideration for

the purpose of providing mechanical strength. Martincic et al. discloses the cooling duct

material differs from encapsulating resin material.

Regarding claim 28, the specific length to width ratio of the cooling duct tube would have

been an obvious design consideration based on the intended size of the device.

Regarding claims 24, 33 and 38, the specific method would have been necessitated by

the apparatus.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-40 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to TUYEN T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-1996.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/026,199

Art Unit: 2832

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ELVIN ENAD can be reached on 571-272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTN TTN

Tengen T. Ngangler